

Appl. No. 10/824,126
Atty Docket No. CM-2737ML
Response dated November 19, 2007
Reply to Office Action dated August 24, 2007

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are now in the case.

Claims 22 and 23 have been canceled with this amendment in response to the Restriction Requirement. Claims 2, 3, 5, 14, 16 and 18 have been amended to remove the term "preferably" from the claims.

Response to the Office Action

The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Leonard '564 in view of Leonard '380 and Purzycki

Claims 1-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,178,564 to Leonard et al. (hereinafter "Leonard '564") in view of U.S. Patent 6,662,380 to Leonard et al. (hereinafter "Leonard '380") and further in view of U.S. Patent 4,666,671 to Purzycki et al. (hereinafter "Purzycki"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The references do not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness since they do not teach or suggest all of Applicants' claim limitations. Specifically, none of the cited references teach or suggest a lavatory bowl rim block having both 1) a liquid, perfume-containing composition with a dispenser and 2) a fragrance delivery component in which the fragrance is not dispensed using the liquid, perfume-containing composition dispensing means.

Applicants' claimed invention relates to a novel method of providing the dual benefit of lavatory bowl cleaning and a separate fragrance source that provides a prolonged scent benefit. The references cited in the Office Action all relate to providing scent via the bowl cleaning composition (liquid or solid). Applicants' claimed invention clearly requires the presence of a fragrance delivery component that does not use the dispenser for the liquid bowl cleaner. Applicants respectfully submit that this separate fragrance element is not taught or suggested by any of the cited references. Therefore, Applicants contend that the combination of Leonard '564 in view of Leonard '380 and Purzycki does not establish a *prima facie* case of

Appl. No. 10/824,126
Atty Docket No. CM-2737ML
Response dated November 19, 2007
Reply to Office Action dated August 24, 2007

obviousness since they don't disclose an element of Applicants' claimed invention (see MPEP 2143.03). As a result, Applicants contend that their claimed invention is novel and unobvious and that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be withdrawn.


Conclusion

It is submitted that Claims 1-21 are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action on all claims is therefore requested.

If the next action is other than to allow the claims, the favor of a telephonic interview is requested with the undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY



Brent M. Peebles
Registration No. 38,576
(513) 627-6773

Dated: November 19, 2007
Customer No. 27752